UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,312	03/12/2004	Juan Carlos Martinez	07781.0156-00	1750

22852   7590   08/04/2009
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
SHIU, HO T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2457	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 May 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-49* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-49 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

3.   **Claims 1-10, 23-32, and 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as**

being unpatentable over Lonnroth et al. (US Patent # 6,826,597 B1,

hereinafter Lon) in view of Dutta et al. (US Patent # 6,615,212 B1,

hereinafter Dutta).

4.   With respect to claims 1 and 23, Lon discloses a computer-implemented

method and a computer readable media embodying a program for automatically

configuring a translation code, the method comprising: translating data within a

server into a data format required by a client using the translation code (col. 4,

lines 6-16); transmitting the translated data from the server to the client (col. 4,

lines 6-24) automatically adapting the translation code to the changed data

format upon receipt of the data object definition message (col. 4, lines 6-24).

Although Lon clearly discloses in col. 4, lines 6-11, that the pre-processor are to

receives requests in which the request objects take the form of XML documents

(data definition object/message), Lon does not clearly disclose transmitting a

change of the data format from the client to the server in a data object definition

message.

In the same field of endeavor, Dutta discloses a computer-implemented

method and a computer readable media embodying a program for automatically

configuring a translation code, the method comprising: translating data within a

server into a data format required by a client using the translation code (col. 7,

lines 44-67, col. 8, lines 1-22, col. 9, lines 13-67, col. 10, lines 1-7); transmitting

the translated data from the server to the client (col. 7, lines 44-67, col. 8, lines 1-

22, col. 9, lines 13-67, col. 10, lines 1-7); transmitting a change of the data

format from the client to the server in a data object definition message (col. 5,

lines 44-52, col. 7, lines 44-67, col. 8, lines 1-22, col. 9, lines 13-67, col. 10, lines

1-7); and automatically adapting the translation code to the changed data format

upon receipt of the data object definition message (col. 7, lines 44-67, col. 8,

lines 1-22, col. 9, lines 13-67, col. 10, lines 1-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lon with

transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server in a data

object definition message as disclosed in Dutta in order to be able to improve the

method of transcoding data formats and sending information to minimize

transmission times. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

incorporate the teachings of one another in order to be able to increase in

efficiency in the system by allowing clients to retrieve data from data sources that

do not necessarily support the same protocols.

5.   With respect to claims 2 and 24, Lon discloses wherein the data object

definition message is automatically transmitted from the client to the server upon

change of the data format within the client (col. 4, lines 6-16, when requests are

made, client is changing the format required by the client).

6.   With respect to claims 3 and 25, Lon discloses wherein the translation

code is adapted to the changed data format within a translation code generator

upon receipt of the data object definition message (col. 6, lines 2-7).

7.   With respect to claims 4 and 26, Lon discloses wherein the translated data

is transmitted from the server to the client using a standard object description

language (col. 4, lines 16-24).

8.   With respect to claims 5 and 26, Lon discloses wherein the data object

definition message is transmitted from the client to the server using a standard

object description language (col. 4, lines 6-16).

9.   With respect to claims 6 and 27, Lon discloses wherein the data format

required by the client is extracted and translated from the stored data by the

translation code prior to sending the translated data from the server to the client

(col. 5, lines 31-37, col. 8, lines 22-30).

10.   With respect to claims 7 and 28, Lon discloses the translation code uses

XSL for translating the data into said the data format required by the client (col. 4,

lines 6-24, col. 7, lines 39-49).

11.   With respect to claims 8 and 29, Lon discloses wherein the server

provides a data object definition message format (col. 5, lines 31-37).

12.   With respect to claims 9 and 30, Lon discloses further comprising the step

of managing access to the server by the data object definition messages via an

authorization management procedure (col. 5, lines 21-30).

13.   With respect to claims 10 and 31, Lon discloses further comprising the

step of managing data formats of different clients via a version management

procedure (col. 4, lines 56-67, col. 5, lines 1-3).

14.   With respect to claim 45, Lon discloses a computer system for

automatically configuring a translation code, the system comprising:

a code generator, associated with a server, that provides the translation code

and which includes a subcomponent that adapts the translation code

automatically to a change of data format upon receipt of a data object definition

message (col. 4, lines 6-24); and a translating means, for translating data into a data format required by a client based on the translation code (col. 4, lines 6-24). Although Lon clearly discloses in col. 4, lines 6-11, that the pre-processor are to receives requests in which the request objects take the form of XML documents (data definition object/message), Lon does not clearly disclose transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server in a data object definition message.

In the same field of endeavor, Dutta discloses a computer-implemented method and a computer readable media embodying a program for automatically configuring a translation code, the method comprising: translating data within a server into a data format required by a client using the translation code (col. 7, lines 44-67, col. 8, lines 1-22, col. 9, lines 13-67, col. 10, lines 1-7); transmitting the translated data from the server to the client (col. 7, lines 44-67, col. 8, lines 1-22, col. 9, lines 13-67, col. 10, lines 1-7); transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server in a data object definition message (col. 7, lines 44-67, col. 8, lines 1-22, col. 9, lines 13-67, col. 10, lines 1-7); and automatically adapting the translation code to the changed data format upon receipt of the data object definition message (col. 7, lines 44-67, col. 8, lines 1-22, col. 9, lines 13-67, col. 10, lines 1-7).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lon with transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server in a data object definition message as disclosed in Dutta in order to be able to improve the

method of transcoding data formats and sending information to minimize

transmission times. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to

incorporate the teachings of one another in order to be able to increase in

efficiency in the system by allowing clients to retrieve data from data sources that

do not necessarily support the same protocols

15.   With respect to claim 46, Lon discloses wherein the translating means

extracts the information required by the client from the data prior to sending the

translated data from the server to the client (col. 5, lines 31-37, col. 8, lines 22-

30)

16.   With respect to claim 47, Lon discloses further comprising a managing

procedure that manages the data format of the data object definition message

(col. 7, lines 39-49).

17.   With respect to claim 48, Lon discloses further comprising an access

control procedure that controls access to the server by the data object definition

messages (col. 5, lines 21-30)

18.   With respect to claim 49, Lon discloses further comprising a detection

procedure that automatically detects changes in the data format (col. 6, lines 1-3,

lines 32-52).

19.   **Claims 11-13, 15-22, 33-35, 37-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

as being unpatentable over Lon and Dutta as applied to claims 1 and 23 in

view of Bauer et al. (US Patent # 5,884,325, hereinafter Bauer).

20.   With respect to claims 11 and 33, Lon and Dutta does not clearly disclose

upon change of the data format, the server requests the data object definition

message from the client and the client transmits the data object definition

message upon request to the server.

In the same field of endeavor, Bauer discloses upon change of the data

format, the server requests the data object definition message from the client and

the client transmits the data object definition message upon request to the server

(col. 1, lines 50-57, col. 2, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Lon and

Dutta with upon change of the data format, the server requests the data object

definition message from the client and the client transmits the data object

definition message upon request to the server as taught in Bauer in order to

ensure that the files of the server are up-to-date with the files of the client. One

of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings

of one another in order to be able to establish a more efficient system by being

able to synchronize data in two databases.

21.   With respect to claims 12 and 34, Lon discloses wherein the server

automatically detects changes in the data format of data associated with the

server (col. 6, lines 1-3, lines 32-52)

22.   With respect to claims 13 and 35, Lon discloses the computer-

implemented method of claim 12, wherein the changes in the data format are

detected by version identification (col. 7, lines 39-49)

23.   With respect to claims 15 and 37, Lon discloses wherein the translation

code is adapted to the changed data format within a translation code generator

upon reception of the data object definition message (col. 6, lines 2-7).

24.   With respect to claims 16 and 38, Lon discloses wherein the translated

data is transmitted from the server to the client using a standard object

description language (col. 4, lines 16-24).

25.   With respect to claims 17 and 39, Lon discloses wherein the data object

definition message is transmitted from the client to the server using a standard

object description language (col. 4, lines 6-16).

26.   With respect to claims 18 and 40, Lon discloses wherein the data required

by the client is extracted and translated from the stored data by the translation

code prior to sending the translated data from the server to the client (col. 5, lines

31-37, col. 8, lines 22-30).

27.   With respect to claims 19 and 41, Lon discloses the translation code uses

XSL for translating the data into the data format used by the client (col. 4, lines 6-

24, col. 7, lines 39-49).

28.   With respect to claims 20 and 42, Lon discloses wherein the server

provides a data object definition message format (col. 5, lines 31-37).

29.   With respect to claims 21 and 43, Lon discloses further comprising the

step of managing access to the server by the data object definition messages via

an authorization management procedure (col. 5, lines 21-30).

30.   With respect to claims 22 and 44, Lon discloses further comprising the

step of managing data formats of different clients via a version management

procedure (col. 4, lines 56-67, col. 5, lines 1-3).

31.   **Claims 14 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over Lon and Dutta as applied to claims 1, 11, 12, 23, and 33

in view of Koskimies (US Pub # 2003/0233383, hereinafter Kosk).

32.   With respect to claims 14 and 36, Lon and Dutta do not clearly disclose

wherein the changes in the data format are detected during an exchange of data

between the server and the client.

        In the same field of endeavor, Kosk discloses wherein the changes in the

data format are detected during an exchange of data between the server and the

client ([0050], lines 1-24).

        Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Lon and

Dutta with wherein the changes in the data format are detected during an exchange of data between the server and the client as disclosed in Kosk in order to be able to synchronize the client and the server in an efficient manner by knowing beforehand that a synchronization between the client and server is needed. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of one another in order to be able to establish a more efficient system by allowing more sophisticated adaptive selection of data for synchronization configuration.

Response to Arguments

33.   Applicant's arguments filed 04/10/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

34.   According to pages 14-16 of applicant's arguments, applicant's argue that Lon or Dutta do not disclose "transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server in a data object definition message." The examiner respectfully disagrees. Lon clearly discloses in col. 4, lines 6-24 that the pre-processor receives requests and from clients and generates request objects based thereon. Lon clearly discloses using a data object definition message. Although one of ordinary skill in the art would have also known to request objects using XML from the client, this is not an inherent feature. However, Dutta clearly discloses in col. 5, lines 44-52 that the clients use and support an Extensible

Markup Language (XML) format for sending and receiving content.   In addition,

Dutta discloses in col. 7, lines 44-54 that the client sends HTTP request to the

transcoding proxy server for converting requests in one format to requests in a

different format and has a plug in for converting http into a modified http request.

Immediately following on the next paragraph, col. 7, lines 55-61, Dutta discloses

that the transcoding proxy also has an XML to HTML transcoder plugin, which

means that the requests originating from the client is of XML and in which the

server requires the request to be in HTML and the plugin from transcoding the

XML request to HTML is needed. When a request for a file in which the format is

different than what the format of the file is now currently, a change of data format

is established as the system knows that a translation of data format need to take

place. Therefore, clearly Lon and Dutta in combination clearly disclose

transmitting a change of the data format from the client to the server in a data

object definition message.

35.   According to pages 14-17, Lon and Dutta do not disclose "automatically

adapting the translation code to the changed data format upon receipt of the data

object definition message". The examiner respectfully disagrees. Lon clearly

discloses that after it receives requests from the client, it forwards the requests to

the server in which the server translates the format of the requested entity. The

examiner notes that since the translation of the format that is being executed with

respect to the requests by a client, in which the request was in the form of a data

object definition message, it clearly discloses what the applicant's have claimed

as "automatically adapting the translation code to the changed data format upon

receipt of the data object definition message."

Conclusion

36.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of

time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire

THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory

action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will

the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

37.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from

the examiner should be directed to HO SHIU whose telephone number is

(571)270-3810. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur (8:30am -

4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the

examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is

assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HTS   Ho Shiu
01/30/2009   Patent Examiner
                                                 GAU 2457

/ARIO ETIENNE/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2457